

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims of the present application are respectfully requested.

In the present Office Action, Claim 1 is objected because of the term "one" which appears in line 4 of the claim. In response to this informality, applicants have deleted the term "one" from Claim 1, line 4. Applicants observe that this amendment to Claim 1, line 4 obviates the informality noted by the Examiner in the present Office Action. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal thereof are respectfully requested.

Claims 10-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicants regard as their invention. In particular, the Examiner indicates that it is not clear whether the annealing step recited in Claims 10 and 15 is the same as the annealing step recited in Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the annealing step recited in Claims 10 and 15 is an activation anneal, which is different from the annealing step of Claim 1 which provides the relaxed SiGe-on-insulator substrate. Thus, applicants have amended Claims 10-19 to positively recite that the claimed annealing step mentioned in those claims is an activation anneal. Support for this amendment to Claims 10-19 is found in Paragraph [0044] of the originally filed specification.

In view of the above amendments to Claims 10-19, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been obviated. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge, with thanks, the Examiner's remarks that Claims 2-9, particularly, Claims 2, 3, 7 and 8, would be allowable, if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In light of this indication, and to expedite prosecution of the present application, applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 36 to include the features of allowable Claims 2, 3, 7 and 8. Specifically, Claims 1 and 36 have been amended to positively recite the steps that are employed in the providing step. Since Claims 1 and 36 have been amended to include features that are deemed allowable by the Examiner, the claims of the present application are allowable.

In view of the above, the following rejections have been obviated:

- (i) Claims 1, 20-22, 24, 25 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) citing U.S. Patent No. 6,812,116 to Huang et al.
- (ii) Claims 1, 20, 21, 26, 29-31 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) citing U.S. Patent No. 6,828,214 to Notsu et al.
- (iii) Claims 23, 26-31 and 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 citing Huang et al.
- (iv) Claims 22-25, 27, 28 and 32-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 citing Notsu et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is firmly believed that the present case is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Leslie S. Szivos
Registration No. 39,394